

Stage 1: Rapid Impact Checklist

Document title: School and Division Restructuring Proposals

Author & School/Service: Eilidh Fraser, People Services

Reason for the Equality Impact Assessment:

Proposed new document	
Proposed change to existing document	
Review of existing document	
Other (please state): Proposed restructure of Schools and Divisions.	x

NB for the purposes of this EIA, the 'document' refers to the proposed restructure as set out in papers to Court and consulted upon between February and April 2024.

Could any protected characteristics be affected by this proposal?¹

Yes	No
x	

If yes, which protected characteristic groups could be affected?

Age		Disability	x
Gender reassignment		Pregnancy and maternity	
Race/ethnicity		Religion or belief (including lack of belief)	
Sex		Sexual orientation	

Will the proposal have any impact on:

	Yes	No
Discrimination?		x
Equality of opportunity?		x
Relations between groups?		x

¹ 'Proposal' is used as shorthand for any policy, procedure, strategy or proposal that might be assessed.

Will the proposal have an impact on the physical environment? For example, will there be impacts on:

Living conditions?	X
Working conditions?	X
Pollution or climate change?	X
Accidental injuries or public safety?	X

If the answer to any of the above is 'yes', please proceed to complete the Comprehensive Equality Impact Assessment, overleaf.

Stage 2: Comprehensive Equality Impact Assessment (CEIA)

Details of document

Document title	As above
Document owner	Senior Management Team
School/Service	

Aim of the document

What are the aims and objectives of the document?
As set out in the Court papers for 20 February and 24 April 2024. NB. This EIA relates only to the restructuring proposals, not to other reviews (e.g. portfolio review)

How important is the document in terms of equality in the University? Does it relate to an area with known inequalities or where equality objectives have been set by the University?
The restructuring proposals have no direct relevance to equality in the University – no direct equality impact has been identified in relation to the proposed new structure or options considered, in themselves. It is recognised, however, that implementation of the proposed structure will result in a period of change and adaptation and such changes (e.g. involving a change of line manager or team colleagues) may be more challenging for some disabled staff.

Who is affected by the document and how have they been involved in the development of it?
<p>All academic staff in schools or divisions affected by the changes in structure will be affected to the extent of potentially having a change to line manager, team colleagues and/or local organisational arrangements.</p> <p>Most affected are the Deans of Schools, Heads of affected Divisions and those in School-level roles (TQLs, SAAs, RKE leads, International and Partnership roles) which are subject to change/review. The proposal includes measures to minimise impact on those whose roles are potentially affected, by offering alternative roles and protection if required. The number of staff in such roles is too small to identify particular patterns in relation to equality characteristics.</p> <p>All staff have been consulted on the proposed changes as set out in the Court papers, with those most affected informed in advance of the open consultation. Consultation included the Trade Unions and the Lead Voices. Feedback was received through open meetings, a dedicated email address and directly through SMT members.</p>

Are any persons affected by the document likely to benefit from it and in what way?

The proposed changes are expected to be beneficial overall. No specific individual or equality group is identified as benefiting in particular.

Is there any evidence or concern that any of the protected characteristic groups have different experiences, issues or needs in relation to this document? (Please provide details in the box below)

Age		Race	
Disability	x	Religion or Belief	
Gender Reassignment		Sex	
Pregnancy & Maternity		Sexual Orientation	
Marriage & Civil Partnership			

Further details: There is no direct equality impact. However, feedback highlighted that change of this sort can be more challenging for some disabled staff. In particular, it was noted that a change of line manager and/or colleagues may require staff to build new relationships and understanding in respect of their condition, adjustments and/or needs. That could affect those with physical disabilities, mental health conditions and neurodiverse staff. A similar effect might potentially also be experienced by any staff who needed to communicate personal information to a new manager/colleagues (e.g. re pregnancy).

How does the document fit into the broader strategic aims of the University?

As set out in the papers.

Consideration of available data

(Consider what data is available. Data can include surveys, focus groups, analysis of complaints made, feedback received, consultations, etc.)

What do we know from existing data already held by the University?

Numerical data is not relevant for this EIA, due to the small numbers directly impacted. In relation to qualitative data, there was no formal feedback received relating to EDI. However, informal discussion highlighted the potentially greater challenges of change for some disabled staff as noted above. It was noted that this was not specific to this particular proposal but would often arise when there is a change (including where a line manager left and was replaced).

What do we know from existing data which is available externally?

N/A

Are there any apparent gaps in knowledge?

This EIA does not address any changes that might follow the restructure, e.g. any relocation or Estates changes.

Impact of document

Could this document lead to any positive, negative, intended or unintended impact on the University or any of its stakeholders?

Yes – largely expected to be positive but noted that there may be short-term impact as changes are implemented.

Could there be a differential² impact on any protected characteristics? Could any differential impact be adverse?

Yes, as noted above.

Please consider

Is this policy directly discriminatory? If yes, is it intended to increase equality? If no, this is unlawful discrimination.

Is this policy indirectly discriminatory? If yes, is this justifiable or proportionate? If no, this is unlawful discrimination.

If this policy is not indirectly discriminatory, but could have an adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics, you must provide details of how the University will act to address this.

Is this policy unlawfully discriminatory? If you find that it is, you must decide how the University will act lawfully.

² Differential impact = where the positive or negative impact on one particular protected characteristic is likely to be greater than on another.

Consultation

What did this equality analysis conclude?
The proposal is not discriminatory. However, it could have a short-term differential impact on some groups (in common with many changes).

Is any action required to be taken in response to the findings from the consultation?
<p>Action: People Services to work closely with the managers of all staff affected to ensure that the needs of disabled staff and those with other relevant conditions/needs, particularly those with a complex situation or needs, are taken into account as part of implementing the new structure and reviewing operational models and practices.</p> <p>The Deans will also be advised to consider EDI in relation to any changes consequent to the restructure, such as any physical relocation or workplace changes, and in relation to new school structures and activities (including EDI and staff wellbeing and engagement groups and action plans).</p> <p>Informal feedback also highlighted the need to consider individuals’ workload capacity in relation to the new structure itself, and the implementation process – taking particular account of part-time working hours or other effects.</p>

What is the recommendation for this document following consultation?

Reject the document		Approve and publish the document	x
Amendment required		Other (please provide details below)	

Declaration

I confirm that this equality analysis represents a fair and reasonable view of the implications of the document for all protected characteristic groups, and that appropriate actions have been identified to address the findings.

Eilidh Fraser, Director of People & OD	CEIA owner
	Line manager (if appropriate)

Committee approval

Which Committee has this document gone before for approval?
University Court
Date of Committee meeting: April 2024

Following Committee consultation, what is the decision for this document?

Reject the document		Approve and publish the document	x
Amend the document		Other (please give details below)	

If the Committee requires that the document be amended, please list amendments below.